

Background to Coding

<p>Canada (CAN)</p>	<p>General information</p> <p>Canada only started tabling treaties in Parliament in 2008, when the Harper government issued a new policy stating that they would.</p> <p>This revives an older practice from 1926 to 1966. From 1966 to 2008, treaties were not tabled prior to ratification. Only implementing legislation was presented when required.</p> <p>Background document: https://lop.parl.ca/sites/PublicWebsite/default/en_CA/ResearchPublications/200845E</p>
	<p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p> <p>-</p>
	<p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>-</p>
	<p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>-</p>
	<p>General information</p> <p>Parliamentary approval is needed when a treaty concerns national legislation. Political relevance also matters, and the government has some room for interpretation there. The practice is that even in less relevant cases, the Eduskunta is at least informed. However, parliament may also approve of a treaty by other means than a vote.</p>
	<p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p> <p>-</p>
	<p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>-</p>
<p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>-</p>	
<p>France (FRN)</p>	<p>General information</p> <p>Assemblée nationale URLs only go back until 1997.</p> <p>In case of multiple items being voted in one, we mention the signature date of the overarching treaty (e.g. treaties and protocols), or the first one mentioned (e.g. airspace treaties)</p>
	<p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14.05.91, 18.06.91: We count this cultural treaty between France and German states as bilateral. • 27.01.95, 25.01.95: Treaty on Channel tunnel - interestingly concluded between UK, FR, and private company • 13.12.94, 16.01.95: EU accession treaties codes as multilat and IO with third party • 16.11.99, 29.02.00: Treaty btw France and Arab League for opening an office in France coded as bilateral • 06.01.04, 12.01.05: We count this cross-border cooperation treaty between France, Belgium, and Belgian states as bilateral. • 08.07.08, 23.07.08: Treaty between France and International Bureau of Weights and Measures on office coded as bilateral. • 12.06.08, 23.07.06: Treaty between France and International Bureau of Weights and Measures on immunity coded as bilateral.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30.09.10, 12.07.10: The original treaty between France and Malaysia has been signed on 24 April 1975 • 21.12.2011: Double taxation agreement with Panama rejected multiple times by Sénat but finally adopted by AN >> becoming law • 18.12.12, 01.03.12: Treaty btw EU and Cariforum coded as bilateral and through institutions • 05.12.13, 11.04.13: Treaty between France and IPGRI coded as bilateral. • 19.02.15, 05.03.15: Double taxation agreement with Andorra rejected multiple times by Sénat but finally adopted by AN >> becoming law • EU or NATO accessions are also coded as "diplomacy" (because of their general character), "multilateral" (being formally national ratifications), and "multilateral via intl org" (resulting from EC/EU, NATO action). <p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>France has no recorded party votes.</p> <p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>All EU, NATO enlargements are coded as bilateral AND ratification through international organization; treaty changes are coded as multilateral and ratification through international organization.</p>
<p>Germany (GMY)</p>	<p>General information</p> <p>(Non-)mandatory vote: According to the German constitution (article 59 (2)), "Treaties that regulate the political relations of the Federation or relate to subjects of federal legislation shall require the consent or participation, in the form of a federal law, of the bodies responsible in such a case for the enactment of federal law". The decision whether a treaty falls under this provision and needs parliamentary approval is made by the government with considerable discretion as the wording "political relations" leaves ample room for interpretation. We code this variable as "mandatory".</p> <p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p> <p>Auch beim "Gesetz über die Inkraftsetzung von Vereinbarungen betreffend den befristeten Aufenthalt von Streitkräften der Französischen Republik, der Union der Sozialistischen Sowjetrepubliken, des Vereinigten Königreichs Großbritannien und Nordirland und der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika in Berlin und von sowjetischen Streitkräften auf dem in Artikel 3 des Einigungsvertrages genannten Gebiet nach Herstellung der Deutschen Einheit" handelt es sich um eine Verordnungsermächtigung, nicht um eine Ratifikation. Der Eintrag wurde deshalb entfernt.</p> <p>Auch beim "Gesetz über die Ermächtigung des Gouverneurs für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland in der Internationalen Finanz-Corporation zur Stimmabgabe für eine Änderung des Abkommens über die Internationale Finanz-Corporation (IFC-Abkommensänderungsgesetz)" handelt es sich um eine Ermächtigung, keine Ratifikation. Der Eintrag wurde daher entfernt.</p> <p>Der Eintrag "Gesetz zur Änderung des Gesetzes zum NATO-Truppenstatut und anderer Gesetze (Verteidigungslastenzuständigkeitsänderungsgesetz - VertLastÄndG)" wurde ebenfalls gelöscht, weil es kein Ratifizierungsverfahren ist, sondern eine Änderung der Arbeitsteilung zwischen Bund und Ländern, die nicht auf eine internationale Vereinbarung zurückgeht.</p> <p>Beim "Gesetz zu den Anpassungsprotokollen zu den Europa-Abkommen zwischen den Europäischen Gemeinschaften und ihren Mitgliedstaaten einerseits, der Republik Ungarn, der Tschechischen Republik, der Slowakischen Republik, der Republik Polen,</p>

	<p>der Republik Bulgarien und Rumänien andererseits" gibt es mehrere Daten für die Unterzeichnung der Abkommen (je nach Land). Es wurde das letzte genommen.</p> <p>Beim "Gesetz zu internationalen Übereinkommen über den Schutz der Meeresumwelt des Ostseegebietes und des Nordostatlantiks" handelt es sich um die Ratifikationsverfahren von drei Vereinbarungen. Das Datum der jüngsten wurde übernommen.</p>	
	<p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>-</p>	
	<p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>Translations of German titles into English, coding of issue area(s) by Svenja McGrath in November/December 2020.</p>	
Italy (ITA)	<p>General information</p> <p>Parl-level: all votes from June 2001 (beginning of Berlusconi II government) to the end of 2019 at the Chamber of Deputies (lower and largest chamber)</p> <p>Party-level: all votes from June 2001 (beginning of Berlusconi II government) to the end of 2005 at the Chamber of Deputies (lower and largest Chamber).</p>	
	<p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p> <p>-</p>	
	<p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>CCD and CDU merged in 2002 in UDC but I count the parties voted together from the beginning of the XIV legislature (June 2001). Therefore they are listed as UDC</p> <p>We recode Lega (Nord) as a radical-right party because of its nation-wide political position-taking.</p> <p>We recode PRC as radical-left because it is a radical faction that split from the centrist Democrats of the Left.</p>	
	<p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>-</p>	
		<p>General information</p> <p>There are no URLs prior to 1998. Until then, data has been hand-coded from a pdf registry file.</p>
		<p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p> <p>11 Oct and 13 Oct 2011 - European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF): The treaty was voted twice: too small quorum first time, revoted in exchange for Radicova government stepping down -> early elections, then passed the second time.</p>
		<p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>We decided to code the HZDS party (HZDS-RSS, LS-HZDS) as „no family“. Party family attribution is contested (MARPOR and CHES classify differently) and the party's ideological positioning is inconsistent.</p>
	<p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>-</p>	
	<p>General information</p> <p>-</p>	
	<p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p>	

<p>Spain (SPN)</p>	<p>Humanitarian Aid Haïti vote 2010: This priorly undetected vote was conducted under a different procedure ("request of ratification of a decision of the council of ministers") than the other formal deployment authorizations and has been included from version #3 of the database onwards.</p> <p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>BNG (Bloque Nacionalista Galego): This is a left-wing party, somewhere between socialist and radical-left. Since the 2000s, it became more moderate with the departure of its communist currents. Massetti (2009) classifies the BNG as mainstream left, hence we code it as social-democratic.</p> <p>CC (Coalición Canaria): This is a centre-right party that fits our chriscon category. See also classification in Massetti (2009) where the party is classified as centre-right.</p> <p>Convergència i Unió (CiU/CDC/PDeCAT): This party used to be a coalition of Liberals and Christian-Democrats. The former were dominant and Massetti (2009) also classifies CiU as a centre party. CiU had also a long tradition within the European Liberal party (ALDE). Therefore, we code it as liberal.</p> <p>Compromís: This is a left-wing, ecologist party. The European affiliation is Greens-EFA, hence coded Green.</p> <p>Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya (ERC): This is a left-wing party, somewhere between socialist and radical-left, depending on the time. The party denominates itself as social-democratic and Massetti (2009) classifies it as mainstream left, hence we code it as social-democratic.</p> <p>Foro Asturias: This is a conservative party. It is not possible to identify the European affiliation but it usually runs to elections in coalition with the PP, hence coded Chriscon.</p> <p>Geroa Bai: No family was chosen, because the coalition includes parties that vary widely in the ideological spectrum, from left to right.</p> <p>Partido Nacionalista Vasco (PNV/EAJ): This is a centre-right party that can be classified as chriscon. Massetti (2009) also classifies it as mainstream right.</p> <p>Unión del Pueblo Navarro: This is a conservative party. It is not possible to identify the European affiliation but it is a sort of Navarrese branch of the PP, hence Criscon.</p> <p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>-</p>
<p>Turkey (TUR)</p>	<p>General information</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For Turkey, the ratification of an international treaty takes place by the Turkish parliament adopting a law on the ratification of this treaty. 2. In the years 2000 to 2018, the number of yes/no/abstention-votes as well as absences from the vote are sorted by the name and party affiliation of the MPs. In the 1990s as well as from 2018 onward, the minutes of sessions have only the total numbers of yes and no-votes and also of abstentions, if there are any. The votes when votes cast by party are not included in the minutes, then these votes are stated in the Parliamentary level data, but not in the party votes.

	<p>3. This dataset includes the main multilateral treaties Turkey has ratified. There are a few samples from bilateral treaties. A dataset that would include all bilateral agreements of Turkey ratified after 1990 would need to include almost a thousand of agreements, which is an endeavour that goes far beyond the means of the current project. Further research time in the future can be devoted to developing the bilateral agreements part of this dataset.</p> <p>4. The following patterns of voting has been discovered in cases where the party affiliations of all MPs were given in the minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are very few no votes or abstentions. - Generally the governing party (-ties) are present in the parliament in MP numbers adequate to adopt a law. - The opposition parties are mostly absent in these votes. - When opposition parties are present to cast a vote, they do so in small numbers generally less than or around 10 votes. - Multilateral agreements are generally not matters of dissent. - Exceptions from the pattern emerge when the treaty in question is of high stake for Turkey, like the bilateral agreements on energy with Russia (1999) and military cooperation with Libya (2019) or Qatar (2017). <p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p> <p>Turkey has become party to the Kyoto protocol and to the Moon Treaty by way of accession, thereby ratifying these treaties without signing them. Therefore, no date of signature are available.</p> <p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>-</p> <p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>-</p>
<p>United Kingdom (UKG)</p>	<p>General information</p> <p>In reporting the total number of votes tellers were excluded</p> <p>Division numbers are counted from each general elections.</p> <p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p> <p>In the House of Commons, MPs cannot vote “abstain”. However, they can cast a vote in favor and a vote against, which is a functional equivalent of an abstention, and we record it as such.</p> <p>We list the final reading of each bill. So for those which pass this is the third reading. For those that are 'killed' at the second reading we report the second reading. (No vote takes place at first reading). So, in essence, this is the final vote on each of the agreements.</p> <p>All the votes are Commons votes. We looked into the Lords votes but it seems the upper chamber only voted on Amendments to these bills, and did not hold a decisive</p>

	<p>vote on the bills themselves. Thus we exclude them on the basis that they are not full votes.</p> <p>European Union Withdrawal Agreement was endorsed by leaders at a special meeting of the European Council on 25 November 2018.</p> <p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>The Scottish National Party and Plaid Cymru are listed as 'social-democratic' parties rather than 'regionalist' (as in CHES) as this captures their ideological position while the dummy 'regionalist' variable captures their status as regional parties.</p> <p>For parties from Northern Ireland, Scotland (SNP) and Wales (PC) the dummy for 'regional party' was included.</p> <p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>Votes were searched through the following websites: https://www.publicwhip.org.uk/divisions.php?rdisplay=all&house=commons https://www.theyworkforyou.com/debates/ https://votes.parliament.uk/Votes/Commons https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/hansard/commons/</p> <p>Votes older than May 1997 were searched through: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/cmjournal.htm</p>
<p>United States (USA)</p>	<p>General information</p> <p>International treaties require "advise and consent" by the U.S. Senate for ratification. Here, a two-third majority is necessary for successful ratification. Trade agreements are distinct from the regular treaty process though: They usually require an implementation act by both chambers of Congress (House and Senate) and only a simple majority. This procedure on trade agreements is contingent on Congress granting the president temporary "trade promotion authority" (TPA). For this database, we only code ratification votes for regular international treaties (Senate), and votes on implementation acts for trade agreements (House and Senate). Note that international treaties may be agreed upon in the Senate via regular roll-call votes and "division votes". The latter occurs quite regularly in cases, which are either deemed of minor political importance or which receive overwhelming bipartisan support. Only in the case of roll-call votes, the position of members of Congress is recorded. Thus, in the case of division vote, there are is no record of party votes. Furthermore, presidents increasingly circumvent the ratification process by concluding executive agreements instead of international treaties. Executive agreements do not require congressional ratification or approval. For the House and the Senate, "non-voting" was not coded as "abstention".</p> <p>Notes on parliamentary-level data</p> <p>-</p> <p>Notes on party-level data</p> <p>-</p> <p>Miscellaneous notes</p> <p>-</p>